

03
Concl
a return signal that is transmitted to the interrogator via the transmitter to provide tracking data for the electronic apparatus.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Claim 12 has been amended to address the informality noted in the office action and withdrawal of the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-15 and 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Isikoff (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,084). While not acquiescing in this rejection, claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended. Support for these amendments may be found, *inter alia*, in Figure 2 and its accompanying description. As such, the applied art is discussed with reference to the amended claims.

Isikoff discloses systems and devices for the location, communication with and management of small, microprocessor-containing electronic devices such as laptop computers. A beacon comprised of a cellular transceiver and a modem is installed in the laptop computer or electronic device for data recovery or tracking of the computer after a theft. In Isikoff, the beacon is operable in a normal communication mode for receiving incoming communications signals such as voice telephone calls, incoming faxes, etc. The microprocessor 30 determines what actions need to be taken within the beacon and what signals need to be sent to the host computer. This differs from the subject matter of

the claims 1, 6 and 11, which call for a communication unit having a control circuit that is separate from utilization circuitry for normal operations of the electronic apparatus. Because Isikoff fails to disclose this feature of claims 1, 6, and 11, Isikoff cannot anticipate these claims or the rejected claims that depend therefrom.

Claims 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Isikoff in view of Heinrich *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,874,902). Heinrich *et al.* is relied upon in the office action for its disclosure of a fusible link. However, Heinrich *et al.* is deficient with respect to the pending claims at least for the reasons set forth in the prior response (which are incorporated herein) and it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Heinrich *et al.* with Isikoff would not have resulted in the subject matter of the rejected claims.

Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Isikoff in view of Chesnutt (U.S. Patent No. 5,966,081). Chesnutt describes that the removal or tampering of an antitheft device can be detected by querying the antitheft device for a unique identification number. If the identification number does not match a number that is stored within the equipment, the equipment assumes the antitheft device has been tampered with and causes the equipment to become inoperative. There is no teaching or suggestion in Chesnutt of storing purchase data or purchaser data for the purpose of determining whether to end a shut-off state -- Chesnutt uses stored data for the purpose of determining whether to initiate a shut-off state. For at least these reasons, the proposed combination would not have resulted in the subject matter of claims 16 and 17.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Isikoff in view of Glenn (U.S. Patent No. 5,406,261). Glenn is cited for its disclosure of a transistor as a power control circuit. However, Glenn does not remedy the deficiencies of Isikoff with respect to claim 11 (from which claim 18 depends). As such, even assuming the proposed combination was proper, it would not result in the subject matter of claim 18.

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over Isikoff in view of Glenn and further in view of Heinrich *et al.* Neither Glenn nor Heinrich *et al.* discloses or suggests the power blocking circuit specified in claims 19 and 20. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion to integrate a fuse into the Figure 8c arrangement of Glenn, much less a teaching or suggestion that a fuse be integrated in a structure like that specified in claims 19 and 20.

Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and action to that end is earnestly solicited.

If any issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is urged to contact the attorney for Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.



Michael J. Shea
Registration No. 34,725

1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, Virginia 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100
MJS:led

Version marked to show changes made

Claims 1, 6, 11 and 12 have been amended as follows:

1. (Twice Amended) An anti-theft device operable with an electronic apparatus, the device comprising:

a remote intelligent communication (RIC) unit contained within a casing of the electronic apparatus and including [structure] a control circuit that is separate from utilization circuitry for normal operations of the electronic apparatus and that enables tracking of the electronic apparatus, said RIC unit operable to receive a signal transmitted from an interrogator, to determine whether the signal is intended for the anti-theft device and whether the signal includes a shut-off command and, if so, to produce a shut-off signal in response; and

a shut-off unit coupled with a power source of the electronic apparatus, said shut-off unit in a shut-off state preventing a flow of electricity via the power source in accordance with said shut-off signal.

6. (Twice Amended) A method of operating an anti-theft device in cooperation with an electronic apparatus, the anti-theft device including a remote intelligent communication (RIC) unit contained within a casing of said electronic apparatus and including a control circuit that is separate from utilization circuitry for normal operations of the electronic apparatus and that receives a signal broadcast from an interrogator, determines whether the signal is intended for the anti-theft device and

whether the signal includes a shut-off command and, if so, produces a shut-off signal in response, and a shut-off unit comprised of components of the RIC unit and coupled with a power source of the electronic apparatus, the method comprising:

- (a) tracking the electronic apparatus with the remote intelligent communication (RIC) unit; and
- (b) preventing with the shut-off unit a flow of electricity via the power source in accordance with the shut-off signal.

11. (Twice Amended) An anti-theft device for shutting off an operable electronic apparatus subsequent to the electronic apparatus being stolen from its owner, the anti-theft device comprising:

a communication unit incorporated within the casing of the electronic apparatus and comprising:

- a receiver for receiving a signal transmitted from an interrogator, and
- a control circuit that is separate from utilization circuitry for normal operations of the electronic apparatus and that is coupled to the receiver [transceiver] for determining whether the received signal is intended for the anti-theft device and, if so, for determining whether the signal includes an electronic apparatus shut-off command generated by the interrogator in response to a notification from the owner that the electronic apparatus has been stolen, and, if so, for producing a shut-off signal, and

a power blocking circuit responsive to the shut-off signal for placing the electronic apparatus in a shut-off state by blocking the flow of electricity from a power source of the electronic apparatus [device].

12. (Amended) The anti-theft device as claimed in claim 11, wherein the communication unit [circuit] further comprises a transmitter and the control circuit also produces a return signal that is transmitted to the interrogator via the transmitter to provide tracking data for the electronic apparatus.